Public Works
Engineering

CREST DRIVE COMMUNITY TEAM PROCESS TRAINING WORKSHOP #3 SUMMARY

City of Eugene
858 Pearl St 3rd Floor
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(541) 682-5727
(541) 682-5598 FAX

Introduction

This summary provides a recap of the third Crest Drive Community Team (CDCT) Process Training Workshop, held on Thursday, April 6, at the Washington Park Community Center. Fifteen members of the CDCT and two alternates attended the meeting (see attached sign in sheet, pg 11). David Roth from the transportation planning team in the Public Works Engineering Division recorded meeting notes. The meeting was facilitated by Josh Reckord and Bill Kentta. The agenda follows:

1. **Warm Up**: "Think-Pair-Share" Elevator Conversation: *What is the Crest Drive Road Committee's responsibility to the City of Eugene as a whole?*
2. **Building Operational Agreements**- continued
    a. Back-up decision making process
    b. Communication
        i. Information in
        ii. Information out
    c. Facilitator selection process (moved to start of meeting)
    d. Ongoing support group for process
    e. What do people need- logistical support?
3. **Presentation of Process Steps**
    a. Setting the stage
    b. Presentation
    c. Clarifying questions
4. **Next Steps**
    a. Meeting April 20th
5. **Debrief**

Before starting with agenda items, Fred Lorish provided the group with an update of the facilitator selection process. Fred explained that the VIPER group had met twice and interviewed two potential facilitator candidates over the past two months. Following the second meeting and interviews, a candidate was selected by the group. Margot Helphand was selected as the facilitator for the CDCT Context Sensitive Solutions process. Fred introduced Margot to the committee after discussing the selection process.

Warm Up: "Think-Pair-Share" Activity

Bill and Josh instructed participants to think and reflect on the following question: "*What is the Crest Drive Road Committee's responsibility to the City of Eugene as a whole?*" Participants were then asked to answer as if a neighbor or acquaintance asked them about the CDCT process in a casual conversation. Participants were paired for discussion. Responses follow:

- To present ideas
- To communicate, openly and honestly, and to reach consensus on a street design
- This is our opportunity to work with the city- we are more responsible to the neighborhood than to the entire city
- We are responsible because of the "pioneering" aspect of this project
- Our responsibility is to come up with a Context Sensitive Design process for the city
- First, we are to come up with an appropriate design for the neighborhood streets. Second, we are responsible to say "no" if we disagree with the design. Third, we have a commitment to the city to see this through.
- To reach consensus

- We are responsible to the City at large, the neighbors, and those who drive through the neighborhood. To the City, we will create a model process. To the neighbors, we will ensure livability. To those who drive through, we will create safe roads.
- Our responsibility is to be collaborative and representative of the neighborhood. We are not one single voice, but rather a representative voice.
- To come up with design preserving the neighborhood characteristics while considering design standards.
- To uphold neighborhood integrity in the context of CSS
- To become an example for the City and the nation.

During the sharing portion of this exercise, a question was posed by one of the committee members. "Out of the scarce available resources dedicated to other projects in the city, how much is being dedicated to this project?" Bill and Josh recommended that this question be addressed during the City of Eugene's informational presentation later in the meeting.

Building Operational Agreements- Continued
This item was a continuation from the two previous meetings. The committee was asked to first consider and discuss implementing a back-up decision-making process.

Back-up Decision-Making Process
Bill addressed comments and questions raised at the previous two meetings in regard to choosing consensus as the model for decision-making for the Crest Drive Process. He noted that in comparison to other decision-making models such as parliamentary voting, consensus requires more up-front time and resources, while greatly reducing implementation time. On the other hand, parliamentary voting requires little up-front time, yet requires much more time and resources for implementation. Bill also noted that using consensus provides the City Council with a better understanding and a clearer picture of the committee's progress. It shows the Council the level of support for items discussed and deliberated. He also noted that building consensus oftentimes begins with a question. "Is there support for….?" Margot noted that she desired having a backup decision-making process to the consensus model. She mentioned that this could simply take the form of a minority report or the inclusion of two separate options. A group discussion followed:

Question: "How will the neighbors be involved in decision-making?"
Response: "Through an established communication process."
Comment: "We don't have the right to make decisions without involving the greater neighborhood."
Comment: "Our role is that of an advisory body- we will make a recommendation."

Comment from Josh: "You are a recommending body. The communication process and roles must be clearly defined from the beginning."
Comment: "Since each street is represented, members of the CDCT will have an efficient means of communication by going door-to-door to talk with neighbors."
Question: "What if one person disagrees? How does this affect the consensus process?"
Response from Josh: "Sometimes that dissenting person must compromise."
Response from Bill: "That person ethically must counter propose or stand aside, in other words, 'put-up or shut-up'."
Response from Margot: "The facilitator might ask what it would take for that person to move forward with the group. That single person cannot block the process though."
Response: "It is an opportunity to contribute to the group process."

At this point, the conversation shifted to the role of alternates on the CDCT.
Josh: We need to determine if alternates have decision-making authority when their committee member is absent.
Question: "Should alternates have decision-making power?"
Josh: "It is the responsibility of the committee member to inform the alternate."
Comment: "Alternate must attend successive meetings to be involved."
Comment: "Alternate is responsible for getting information and staying up to date from their committee member."
Margot: "I'm partial to the idea of just having the committee vote."
Comment: "There may be many different reasons why an alternate would fill in."
Margot: "Having alternates as non-voting members may help build commitment among committee members."
Bill: "In my experience, alternates will generally ask permission to vote. The more difficult question is whether you will allow votes in absentia."
Question: "What is the role of the alternate?"
Response: "To replace the permanent member if they leave, or to fill in for that member while they are absent and to collect information for them so they can make an informed decision."
Response: "They have a vested interest."
Josh: "The group is 22 members in addition to the facilitator."
Question: "Don't the alternates have a responsibility to be here?"
Question: "Is the alternate a voting member?"
Response: "What we need is consistency of participation."
Comment: "You cannot make heavy demands on an alternate and then prohibit them from voting."
Comment: "How about this, alternates can vote if they attend all meetings."
Response: "As an alternate, I'll be here as much as possible, but when it comes to voting, I think I'd vote the same as my committee member."

At this point, Bill introduced two options: Option A: "Alternates may 'vote' assuming they are current with issues and informed" and Option B: "Alternates may not vote." Discussion continued.
Comment: "We could clear up some of this discussion by simply requiring a quorum to be present for decision-making."
Question: "What is the role of the alternate?"
Comment: "We should eliminate alternates and just use a quorum system."
Response: "We would have to go back to the CDCA to change rules."
Comment: "Option B is similar to having no alternates."
Comment: "Alternates should not be forced to attend all meetings."
After a brief discussion about the role of alternates, the committee was instructed to indicate support for the following options. Voting results follow:

Option A: "Alternates may 'vote' assuming they are current with issues and informed." (17)
Option B: "Alternates may not vote." (3)
Option C: "Eliminate alternates." (1)
Following the vote, committee members were asked to show support using the 5-1 consensus model.
Option A passed with the addendum that "Alternates only vote when their permanent member is absent."
Shortly thereafter, the committee was polled for support of the 16/22 person quorum. The quorum rule
requires that 16 of the 22 original committee members must be present for the meeting to proceed and for
decisions to be made. The committee supported the quorum rule unanimously. More discussion follows.

> *Question:* Will there be a schedule to indicate when voting decisions will occur?
> *Response:* There will be a roadmap for the process and there will be a sense for when a vote occurs.
> I'd hate to send people home when a quorum is not present.
> *Comment:* As long as the alternates are informed, they should vote.
> *Question:* Can we change these rules through consensus if we think the alternate is ill informed?
> *Comment:* Flexibility in the schedule is important
> *Comment:* It would be convenient to know well ahead of time when the committee will not have
> meetings scheduled for planning around members' vacation time.

Communication
Following the discussion on decision-making, Bill asked committee members to quickly brainstorm ideas
for getting information in and out of the CDCT (to and from the greater neighborhood). Sticky notes were
collected for inclusion in the public minutes. These are the initial ideas and suggestions:

In	Out
Collection box at Wayne Morse Ranch	Door to door contact with residents on street
Direct conversation with committee member(s)	Word of mouth, CDCA meetings, newsletter & mailings
Door to door canvass for important issues	CDNA newsletter/meetings
Post info at Wayne Morse Ranch	Council/neighborhood newsletter
Committee members' duty to examine code & other factual documents	CDCA Website
Public testimony at the beginning of each meeting	City Website, CDCT website
Questionnaire	Public forums for/in the neighborhood
Website	Neighborhood newsletter articles/updates
Email, single email for entire committee	Register Guard article, Press release
Conversation with CDCT members	Email, email from CDCT street leaders, email listserv
Invite targeted people to this group	Large neighborhood meetings
Open house event, workshops	Personal communication with an assigned list of neighbors regarding our plans
Survey: Face to face, Mailed, Public Forum and survey of affected property owners	Mail outs
Street Meetings	Face to face, door to door
Send questions & concerns through street reps	Monthly updates at CDCA meetings
Keg Party	Monthly RG report
Neighborhood "Living Room" chats	
Door to door contact with residents on street	
Any method that an individual can use to provide input	

Support Group

Josh introduced the concept of a support group and described the currently named VIPER group which was involved in finding and recruiting street leaders as well as selecting a facilitator for the process. Discussion about the need for a support group follows:

Josh: I feel strongly about the need for a support group and I would first pose the question, "Is the VIPER group willing to continue?"

Question: What is the role of this group?

Response: They are like a steering committee and they are there to bounce ideas off of and to assist with meeting logistics.

Josh: They are a partnership between the facilitator and the committee.

Question: Why can't you do these things openly at the meeting?

Response: These things include mechanical help, support, and the role of sounding board. It may include tasks such as printing fliers and gathering materials.

Margot: This group would be very helpful. Most of the time the next meeting agenda would be determined by the previous meeting discussion and this group would be there to serve as a tool to make this clear and accurate.

Response: This group adds transparency and provides a way to vet ideas and to creates a n effective communication mechanism

After some discussion, Bill polled using thumbs up/down to measure support for keeping the VIPER group together throughout the process. One thumb was down, which sparked more discussion.

Comment: This should be a public process- I feel that the facilitator was chosen without an appropriate open process.

Response: This is a time to establish the rules for moving forward.

Response: Main concern is that it hasn't been done yet.

Comment: The VIPER meeting is not open to public comment because it that may inhibit its function and role as a support group. It must be nimble and flexible and will help get info out.

Margot: It will assist with agenda planning and act as a sounding board.

Comment: With too much structure, the group will be unable to fulfill its function.

Comment: Nothing should be hidden.

Comment: We must commit to getting information to all committee members regularly and to have an open notification process.

Comment: An atmosphere of openness would serve to eliminate negativity

The committee was polled on the following two questions: 1) Should the VIPER group continue with current members, and 2) Are the members willing?

1) Poll showed broad support, the VIPER group will continue to act as support for the facilitator
2) All members agreed to continue except for Kathy Saranpa

Immediately after discussion and polling on the support group, a suggestion was made to provide some kind of structural organizing method for the duration of the process. City Staff offered to provide each member of the committee with a binder to store and organize material from meetings. Committee members indicated that the City should provide 10 to 12 binders and include one to be stored at the Wayne Morse Ranch so the public has access to the information. City Staff will bring binders to the next CDCT meeting.

Presentation of Process Steps

City Staff followed with a presentation on Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS), the CDCT Process, and existing local and federal design guidelines and standards.

Lisa presented a definition of CSS as:

Context sensitive solutions (CSS) is a collaborative, interdisciplinary project development approach that involves all stakeholders to develop a transportation facility that fits its physical setting while maintaining safety and mobility for all users, and reflecting community needs. The goal of CSS is to create early, open, honest, and continuous communication and sharing of information and knowledge throughout the design process.

Two follow-up questions were asked:

Question: What is the project website?

Response: It can be found by going to the City of Eugene homepage > Public Works > Projects, click "Crest Drive." You will find links to several CSS and CSD resources there.

Question: Where has CSS been done in Eugene?

Response: It has not been done to this extent before, however examples of CSS in Eugene include River Avenue, 3rd/4th Connector, and to some extent Broadway. In many ways, CSS is the latest buzzword for good planning practices.

Lisa also presented a visual diagram of the CDCT process. It is include on page 7. Following discussion on CSS and the CDCT process, Mark Schoening presented exiting local and federal design guidelines and standards. Handouts describing these standards and guidelines are included on pages 8-10. He discussed the difference between standards and guidelines as:

- **Standards**: The minimum considerations when designing a street.
- **Guidelines**: Should consider, however they are not absolute.

Question: Can we revisit the question raised earlier- What are the resources being used for this project?

Response: This is a prioritized project by the City Council. City Staff requested funding of $240,000 for the entire CDCT process. That does not include road repairs.

Question: Will the CDCT see the budget request?

Response: Probably not the details because it was submitted over 6 months ago.

Question: Is there any flexibility in the budget?

Response: Yes, some.

Question: Will any of the $240,000 be assessed to the property owners?

Response: Money from the general fund will cover some of this cost; however some may be assessed to property owners.

City Staff's presentation and CDCT follow-up questions were stopped at 9:00pm, the end of the scheduled meeting. Committee members were instructed to record any additional comments so they could be recorded in the notes. These questions and comments follow:

- How about input from outside professionals involved in Context Sensitive Design?
- We would like a breakdown of the $240,000. Is there a management fee and others fees?
- Is it true that if my driveway faces a sidewalk, we will not be assessed for a new roadway?
- What does a "collaborative interdisciplinary project development approach" mean?
- If the slope of a street is too severe to be safe for a person in a wheelchair, are the same standards stuck to anyway?
- Add CDCA to the stakeholder list on the visual diagram of the CDCT process.

CDCT Design & Recommendation Process

Project Management Plan		
Input	Project Definition	Decision

Input	Project Definition	Decision
Community & Agency Involvement Plan	Issue Identification	Technical Assessment of Data
Stakeholder Input: -Neighbors, - Property Owners, - Emergency Services, - Transit, -Greater Community -CDCA	Data Collection	Evaluate Alternatives
	City Standards & Regulations	Building Agreements
	Building Agreements	CDCT Recommendat
	Develop Alternatives	Council Decision

Guidelines and Standards Handouts (pg 8-10)

CITY OF EUGENE

Arterial & Collector & Local Street Plan

- o Policy – Maintain and enhance mobility for all modes of surface transportation, including automobiles, bicycles, pedestrians, transit vehicles, emergency responders and freight vehicles.

- o Design Guidelines – general statements about factors that should influence street design

- o Design Standards – specific and required minimum design conditions

- o Criteria for Exceptions – exceptions to design standards can be justified through consideration of the following:

    - o Topography or slope constraints;
    - o Significant trees or other vegetation;
    - o Other natural resource constraints, including wetlands, wildlife habitat, etc.;
    - o Historic resources;
    - o Insufficient right-of-way, and inability to obtain additional right-of-way at reasonable cost and within a reasonable time frame for the project;
    - o Adopted Council policies, including those found in neighborhood plans

FEDERAL

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

- Policy - Civil rights statute that prohibits discrimination against people who have disabilities. Designing and constructing public facilities that are not usable by people who have disabilities constitutes discrimination

- ADA Guidelines for the Right of Way – Draft regulations #2

MINIMUM STREET DESIGN STANDARDS

a. Pavement Width – The minimum pavement width would be 20 feet based upon two 10-foot travel lanes. The minimum travel lane width of 10 feet is based upon the urban service providers dependent on the street system including emergency responders, public transit, and garbage and recycling services. Many of the vehicles providing these services measure 9-1/2 feet from mirror to mirror.

b. Sidewalk - The minimum standard is a sidewalk on at least one side of every new or reconstructed street. The sidewalk would be a hard stable surface, physically separated from the travel lane. This is consistent with the standards of the Access Board, a federal agency with the authority and responsibility to develop accessibility standards under the Americans with Disabilities Act. The minimum unobstructed width of a sidewalk is five feet. This provides sufficient room for two pedestrians to walk side by side or to pass one another. This is one foot wider than the minimum of four feet established by the Access Board.

c. Traffic Calming – Crest, Storey and Friendly are the primary routes for emergency responders. Therefore, the traffic calming options for the three streets include:

Roundabouts	Traffic Circles	Raised Crosswalks
Curb Extensions	Parking Bays	Chicanes
Raised Medians	Pavement Surface Modification	Angled Slow Point with Median
Landscaped Roadway	Midblock Neckdown	Speed Tables

d. Curbless Street – Although fairly simple in design, a curb provides multiple functions for a street including conveyance of drainage, stability to the edge of pavement, physical barrier separating the street from sidewalk and a vertical surface necessary for a street sweeper to be effective. In developing a curbless design, these multiple functions are addressed by numerous design elements including a drainage swale with an underlying perforated pipe, a flush concrete edge, and a setback sidewalk. The effectiveness of a street sweeper cannot be addressed by an additional design feature in a curbless street design.

Public Improvement Design Standards

Design Standards – Street, Sidewalk, Bikeway, Access Way

1. Traffic Impact Analysis
2. Design Speeds, Rate of Vertical Curvature, and Safe Site/Stopping Distances
3. Vertical and Horizontal Curves
4. Grades
5. Intersections
6. Asphalt-Concrete Pavement Design
7. Grade Breaks
8. Minimum Gutter Grade
9. Minimum Valley Gutter Grade
10. Maximum Length of Gutter Flow
11. Curb Grades on Short-Radius Curves
12. Curb Height
13. Sidewalk Grading Type
14. Curbside Sidewalks or Sidewalks on One Side of Street
15. Curb Return Radii
16. Driveway Aprons
17. Driveway Adjustments
18. Barricades
19. Property Owner Permission
20. Street Centerline Location
21. Minimum Centerline Radius
22. Street Taper Lengths
23. Private Streets
24. Street Lights
25. Super Elevation
26. Curb Grade Below 100-year Flood
27. Curb and Alley Grade Design
28. Street Crown
29. Traffic Control Devices
30. Half-street Construction
31. Pedestrian/Bicycle Ways
32. Parking Bays

	Date: April 6, 2006		
	Crest Drive Community Team Sign In Sheet		
✔	Name	Phone	Email
✔	Calciano, Frank	541-485-3680	frank@calciano.com
✔	Farkas, Paul	541-485-0859	farkas5@comcast.net
✔	Gardner, Lisa	541-682-5378	lisa.a.gardner@ci.eugene.or.us
	Gryc, Tina	541-345-2281	tinagryc@yahoo.com
✔	Hawley, Sherie	541-913-2730	sheriehawley@comcast.net
	Hecker, Steven	541-954-1161	shecker@uoregon.edu
✔	Huestis, Hal	541-345-7286	huestisbayley@msn.com
	Jacobson, Cris	541-344-9924	criswebb@aol.com
✔	Lorish, Fred	541-341-3993	florish@comcast.net
✔	McDonald, James	541-683-6027	ecobuilder1@earthlink.net
✔	Neet, Don	541-687-0792	dneet@pacinfo.com
	Reed, Jim	541-344-7985	james_reed@comcast.net
✔	Rowland, Mary	541-345-4195	mmrowland@comcast.net
✔	Rude, John	541-342-6427	john@agedynamics.com
✔	Schoening, Mark	541-682-5243	mark.a.schoening@ci.eugene.or.us
✔	Starling, Ginny and Bill	541-683-2512	bgstarling@comcast.net
	Stewart-Smith, Meg	541-913-5464	msdesign5@comcast.net
✔	Treadway, Cathryn	541-689-7410	ctreadway@hotmail.com
✔	Verrijt, Francina	541-344-3735	fverrijt@pacinfo.com
✔	West, Steve	541-344-9347	
—	Wilken, Lyndell	541-343-3080	lwbicycle@yahoo.com
✔	*Bayley, Carmen	541-345-7286	huestisbayley@msn.com
	*Donahue, Christine	541-683-8220	christinedonahue@msn.com
	*Nielson, Clyde		
	*O'Brien, Kim	541-485-3533	kobrien@uoregon.edu
✔	*Saranpa, Kathy	541-687-7199	ksaranpa@comcast.net
	*Alternates		